

AGENCY

25X1

DATE DIST. 1 Aug 1949

NO. OF PAGES	2
--------------	---

**SUPPLEMENT TO
REPORT NO.**

LANGUAGE

THIS IS UNEVALUATED INFORMATION

25X1

SENATE RATIFICATION OF THE ATLANTIC PACT: Moscow commentaries are quick and unanimous in agreeing that Senate ratification of the Pact is meaningless in view of the world-wide popular opposition to it. "A worthless scrap of paper," says a typical broadcast, adding: "The world movement for peace doomed to failure this aggressive Pact of the Anglo-American imperialists." Another typical Soviet view, heard in at least 15 languages the day after ratification, states: "Their fear of the steadily oncoming crisis impels the American monopolists to accelerate their efforts for a way out of their difficulties... in a mad armaments race." A third Soviet line of attack on the Pact is to stress the alleged "contradictions" dividing the Pact signatories, as witnessed by the reported Anglo-American dispute over the sharing of atomic secrets. Satellite commentaries echo the Soviet line on ratification of the Pact. Warsaw points to the Anglo-American atomic dispute and warns that a war "provoked" by the Americans in Europe would automatically involve the Western European countries. In Berlin, the Red Army's TASSLINE HUNDSCHAU repeats a Moscow charge that ratification was intended to divert attention from the failure of America's "strong-arm" foreign policy, particularly in China. Bucharest stresses the strength of the world-wide "peace movement" and denounces the aggressive intentions of the Pact.

RESTRICTED

DISTRIBUTION
CX

RESTRICTED

25X1

Among Western European reactions, the Paris radio reports on Foreign Minister Schuman's defense of the Pact in the French Parliament, including his assurance that there was no possibility of admitting Germany into the Pact. It also notes Leon Blum's statement that ratification should not injure the chances of a Western-Soviet rapprochement, but might improve them. Norwegian Foreign Minister Lange says that ratification has "materially improved" the world situation, while the Stockholm radio reports that Swedish reaction to ratification is "most decidedly favorable," with one reservation: "Will the United States back up the Pact with arms and supplies?"

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S MESSAGE ON MAP: Moscow charges that MAP has two basic purposes: (1) to stimulate war hysteria and intimidate people with weak nerves, and (2) to support the governing cliques of Western Europe. TASS denounces the President's message for announcing continued support for the U.N., although everyone allegedly knows that U.S. policy is to bypass the United Nations. He is also accused of ignoring the fact that the arms program will put a very heavy burden on the European countries. Moscow further states that the State Department pamphlet explaining MAP "frankly expresses the Administration's anti-Soviet and anti-Communist policy" and that it "deliberately conceives of the arms program as a means of helping to bolster the sagging American economy." Widest currency is given to statements by Senators Taft, Capehart, Vandenberg and others to demonstrate that MAP will have a rough passage through Congress. Satellite comment likewise stresses the "violent Congressional arguments" that MAP will arouse; and the Budapest radio interprets the failure to inform Senator Vandenberg in advance of the proposal as marking "the end of the bipartisan character of the U.S. foreign policy."

West European reaction to the President's message on MAP is tinged with anxiety about the attitude of Congress. In France, the De Gaullist press states that it "would not be satisfied with a Maginot Line on paper," and calls for a precise statement of the strategical role to be allotted to France and of the weapons to be supplied. The independent-leftist LIBERATION stresses that France is incapable of meeting the annual expense needed to create a modern army, but Paris radio commentator Lionel Durand contends that Mr. Truman's program would bring material reinforcement to the security of Europe without affecting its economic development. The London TIMES concedes the "attractiveness" of Vandenberg's conditions in appeasing Congressional opposition but says they might be "highly dangerous" to Europe. The DAILY TELEGRAPH sees some justice in Vandenberg's plans but none at all in Taft's.

RESTRICTED
RESTRICTED